



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,445	01/19/2001	Edward W. Merrill	37697-0033	8881
26633	7590	08/06/2008	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRLMAN LLP			BERMAN, SUSAN W	
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, 7th Floor				
San Diego, CA 92122			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,445	MERRILL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/Susan W. Berman/	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 124-130 and 143-149 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 124-130,143-149 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5-20-08,6-12-08.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06-12-2008 has been entered.

Power of Attorney

It is noted that applicant has filed several requests to change the address to the address associated with customer number 61263. However, no change of address has been made because the Power of Attorney of record is to customer number 26633. No request to change the power of attorney has been received.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is requested to provide the dates of publication for the ROMPP CHEMIC LEXIKON and the Encyclopedia of Material Technology citations on the IDS filed 6-12-2008.

Claim Interpretation and Effective Filing Date

Claims 124-130 and 143-149, as amended, recite the irradiation and subsequent melting method (“IR-SM”) first disclosed in SN 08/726,313, filed 10-02-1996. The instant claims are considered to be fully supported by the disclosure of SN 08/726,313, but not by SN 08/600744 filed 02-13-1996, wherein a method of irradiating UHMWPE in the molten state is disclosed but

subsequent melting after irradiation is not taught. Therefore, the earliest effective filing date of the instant claims wherein the method steps comprise irradiation followed by melting the irradiated UHMWPE is considered to be the 10/02/1996 filing date of SN 08/726,313.

Furthermore, claims 128-129 are not supported by the disclosure of SN 08/600,744 because SN '744 does not disclose the swell ratio or degree of oxidation of the crosslinked UHMWPE. Thus claims 128-129 are not entitled to the 02-13-1996 filing date of SN '744. SN '313 does disclose the swell ratio or degree of oxidation of the disclosed UHMWPE, therefor, the effective filing date for claims 128-129 is considered to be 10/02/1996.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment submitted 06-12-2008 indicates by underlining that the word "irradiated" to recite "melting the irradiated" article is added; however, this limitation was already present in the claims as filed 01-10-2008. The amendment filed 01-10-2008 changed the wording describing the temperature in the heating step. This previous amendment is not present in the claims filed 06-12-2008. The previous amendment of claim 128 to recite "depth from about 20 μm " instead of "depth of between about 20 μm " has been changed back to "depth of between about 20 μm " in the current amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06-12-2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to the following issues.

Applicant argues that reading limitations of the specification into a claim is “impermissible” and that claims are to be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with applicant’s specification. A rejection under 112, second paragraph, is made on the basis of comparison of the claims, as written, and the disclosure of the invention and the determination that the claims fail to describe the invention as set forth in the specification. 35 USC 112, second paragraph, requires that applicant particularly point out and specifically claim the subject matter disclosed as being the invention. It is agreed that claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation when considered in view of the teachings of the prior art.

With respect to inherent functions or properties in a disclosure the relevant passage referred to in MPEP is “To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient”. The examiner cannot “understand” or assume inherency for a claimed process that has not been described within the instant disclosure. No extrinsic evidence has been made of record in the instant case to support inherency for descriptive matter to support recitations in the instant claims not found in the instant disclosure.

Applicant refers to MPEP 2163 (II) saying that “Each claim must be separately analyzed and given its broadest reasonable interpretation in light of and consistent with the written description”. With respect to the instant specification and claims, the claims and entire specification have been reviewed and the examiner’s positions with respect to support for the claim language within the specification as filed have been carefully explained on the record. The

examiner has previously pointed out to applicant how the instant claim language is interpreted in light of and consistent with the specification as filed. It is reiterated that thermal analysis by DSC is not considered to be evidence of a process requiring “remelting” as defined by Shen et al. Applicant is merely melting the treated UHMWPE to ascertain the melting point. See the discussion of DSC in the Declaration under 1.131 of Edward Merrill, section 13, page 6. DSC was used for thermal analysis, not to treat the samples before analysis. DSC is not taught as a process step for obtaining the desired properties of the UHMWPE products.

The data in the Declaration under § 1.131 of Edward Merrill filed 06-20-2007 and discussed in applicant’s remarks has been considered and discussed previously. No new Declaration has been received.

Shen et al: Applicant argues that US ‘900 does not qualify as prior art because applicant’s initial filing date 02-13-1996 for SN 08/600744 is before Shen et al’s earliest filing date of 07-09-1996. This argument is not persuasive because applicant’s effective filing date with respect to the rejected claims is the 10-02-1996 filing date of SN 08/726313. As discussed above and in previous office actions in detail, SN 08/600,744 discloses “MIR” and does not disclose “IR-SM” methods.

Hyon et al: Applicant argues that Hyon et al (6,168,626, having an effective filing date of May 6, 1996) is antededated by applicant’s initial filing. The Hyon et al filing date of 05/06/1996 is before applicant’s 10/02/1996 disclosure of the claimed method comprising irradiating UHMWPE and subsequently melting the irradiated UHMWPE.

Applicant presents arguments regarding the disclosures of Salovey et al '264 and Shalaby et al '411. These arguments are moot since there were no pending rejections over these Patents in the Final Rejection mailed 04-10-2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 124-127, 130 and 143-146 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claims 124 and 125, the recitation “temperature above about 150⁰C” renders the claims indefinite because it is not clear whether the intended temperature is “above 150⁰C” or “about 150⁰C”. With respect to claim 130, the recitation “temperature at or above about 150⁰C” renders the claims indefinite because it is not clear whether the intended temperature is “at 150⁰C” “above 150⁰C” or “about 150⁰C”. With respect to claim 143, the recitation “temperature at or above the melting point” renders the claims indefinite because it is not clear whether the intended temperature is “at the melting point” or “above the melting point”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 124-130 and 143-149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shen et al (6,228,900, having an effective filing date of 07/09/1996). Applicant's effective filing date for a process comprising irradiation followed by melting the irradiated UHMWPE is 10/02/1996 (effective filing date of SN 08/726313). Shen et al disclose a process for preparing a medical implant comprising irradiating an UHMWPE article followed by thermal treatment by remelting and cooling, fabricating an implant and sterilizing. See column 4, lines 8-18 and 46-51, column 5, lines 29-52, column 7, lines 20-31, column 7, line 53, to column 8, line 9, column 8, lines 34-64, Example 1 and Figures 4 and 5. Since the process steps set forth in the instant claims are disclosed by Shen et al, the products resulting therefrom would be expected to have the same properties as the medical implants set forth in instant claims 126-129.

Claims 125-129 and 147-149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hyon et al (6,168,626, having an effective filing date of 05/06/1996). Hyon et al disclose UHMWPE molded articles for artificial joints prepared by irradiating an UHMWPE molded article and subsequently heating to the compression-deformation temperature, a temperature not less than the melting point. The treated UHMWPE is cooled and processed to provide a socket for artificial joints. See column 3, line 16, to column 5, line 13. With respect to claim 126 and 127, the products disclosed by Hyon et al would be expected to have the same properties as the instantly claimed products. The reasons are that Hyon et al disclose the process steps set forth in claim 125 and 128 and the process steps in claim 124 except for sterilizing the implant and that

the properties of the product would be expected to be determined by the irradiation and compression-deformation melting steps.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 124-125, 130 and 143-149 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 124-126 and 128-133 of copending Application No. 10/948440. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same methods steps, i.e. melting and irradiating polyethylene, are set forth in the claims of '440 and in the instant claims. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ UHMWPE as the polyethylene in the method steps set forth in the claims of '440. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to perform the irradiation and heating steps set forth in the claims of '440 in a substantially oxygen-free atmosphere in order to

avoid oxidation of the UHMWPE. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 124-125, 130 and 143-149 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over 126-127 and 135-136 of copending Application No. 10/197209. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same methods steps, i.e. heating above the melting temperature and irradiating the polyethylene, are set forth in the claims of '209 and in the instant claims. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ UHMWPE as the polyethylene in the method steps set forth in the claims of '209. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to perform the irradiation and heating steps set forth in the claims of '209 in a substantially oxygen-free atmosphere in order to avoid oxidation of the UHMWPE. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 124-125, 130 and 143-149 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 127-129 of copending Application No. 10/696362. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same methods steps, i.e. heating above the melting temperature and irradiating the UHMWPE are set forth in the claims of '362 and in the instant claims. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to perform the irradiation and heating steps set forth in the claims of '362 in a substantially oxygen-free atmosphere in order to avoid oxidation of the UHMWPE. This is a

provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 124-130 and 143-149 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 124-129 of copending Application No. 10/901089. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same methods steps, i.e. heating above the melting temperature and irradiating the heated UHMWPE are set forth in the claims of '089 and in the instant claims. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to perform the irradiation and heating steps set forth in the claims of '089 in a substantially oxygen-free atmosphere in order to avoid oxidation of the UHMWPE. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 126-129 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 124,125,129,130,132-134,136, 138, and 145-152 of copending Application No. 10/197263. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the fabricated articles set forth in the claims of '263 are produced by irradiating and melting UHMWPE, as are the products set forth in the instant claims. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Susan W. Berman/ whose telephone number is 571 272 1067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB
8/3/2008

/Susan W Berman/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796